



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

51
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/767,627	01/23/2001	Andrew J. Pennella	PC11666ABTC	3483
7590	05/03/2005		EXAMINER	
McCormick Paulding & Huber LLP CityPlace II, 185 Asylum Street Hartford, CT 06103-3402				FLORES SANCHEZ, OMAR
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		3724		

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/767,627	PENNELLA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Omar Flores-Sánchez	3724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 February 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 13 and 16-40 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-12, 14 and 15 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to applicant's remarks received on 02/11/05.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-6, 9-12, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Althaus (5410812) in view of Althaus (5359774).

Althaus'812 discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a plastic body 1 including a leading edge and a trailing edge, a series of guard ribs 11 that covers at least a portion of the cutting edge (see Fig. 6), cutting blades 2, cutting edges 3, a center guard rib (see Fig. (see fig.1-2), a guard bar 18, a cap (see Fig. 1) and a lubricating strip 21: Althaus'812 does not show guard ribs integrally formed with the body. However, Althaus'774 teaches the use of guard ribs (28 and 29) integrally formed with a body 1 for the purpose of reducing manufacturing cost. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Althaus'812's guard ribs by providing guard ribs integrally formed with the body as taught by Althaus'774 in order to reduce manufacturing cost.

4. Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Althaus (5410812) in view of Althaus (5359774) as applied to claims 1 and 6 above, and further in view of King et al. (6167625 B1).

The modified device of Althaus'812 discloses the invention substantially as claimed except for a series of depressions and projections. However, King et al. teach the use of a series of depressions and projections (see Fig.1) for the purpose of gradually increasing the tension on the skin. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Althaus'812's guard bar by providing the series of depressions and projections as taught by King et al. in order to obtain a guard bar that gradually increase the tension on the skin.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues the combination of Althaus'812 and Althaus '774 fails to disclose a razor blade cartridge having guard ribs integrally formed with the body. However, the combination of Althaus'812 and Althaus '774 teaches the razor blade cartridge having guard ribs integrally formed with the body. Also, Althaus '774 is combined only for the reason that integrally forming the ribs with the body eliminates the disadvantage that the wire is very difficult to assemble to the body making the blade expensive to manufacture, and not for replacing the structural form and the position/location of the ribs of Althaus'812.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Omar Flores-Sánchez whose telephone number is 571-272-4507. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan Shoap can be reached on 571-272-4514. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ofs

April 21, 2005

ACy
Allan N. Shoap

Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3700